

1 Daniel R. Watkins
2 Nevada State Bar No. 11881
3 DW@wl-llp.com
4 Brian S. Letofsky
5 Nevada State Bar No. 11836
6 Brian.Letofsky@wl-llp.com
7 Eran S. Forster
8 Nevada State Bar No. 11124
9 eforster@wl-llp.com
10 WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP
11 8215 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 265
12 Las Vegas, NV 89123
13 Office: (702) 901-7553; Fax: (702) 974-1297

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff, Paula Newman*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

16 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

17 PAULA NEWMAN,
18 Plaintiff;
19 vs.
20 ELDORADO RESORTS CORPORATION, a
21 Florida corporation; MICHAEL MARRS;
22 KRISTEN BECK; DOMINIC TALEGHANI;
23 AND DOES 1-50, inclusive;
24 Defendants.

25 Case No.: 2:15-cv-01486-RFB-PAL

26 **PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR AN
27 EXTENTION TO FILE AN OPPOSITION
28 TO THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGEMENT.**

29 [Plaintiff's Third Request for an Extension to
30 Respond to Dispositive Motions]

31
32 COMES NOW, Plaintiff, PAULA NEWMAN, by and through their attorney of record,
33 hereby submits Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Dispositive Motions.
34 This motion is made under the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (hereinafter "FRCP") rule
35 6(b)(1)(A) and Nevada District Court Local Rules (hereinafter "LR") 6-2 and 26-4. Defendant
36 filed their Motion for Summary Judgment on May 31, 2017. The current deadline for Plaintiff's
37 response is June 30, 2017.

38
39 **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
40 DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS (Third Request)**

1 This motion is based on this Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed
2 herewith, the pleadings and papers filed herein and upon such other matters as may be presented
3 to the Court at the time of the hearing.

4
5
6 DATED: June 24, 2017

WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP

7
8 By: /s/ Daniel R. Watkins

9 DANIEL R. WATKINS
10 BRIAN S. LETOFSKY
11 ERAN S. FORSTER
12 WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP
13 8215 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 265
14 Las Vegas, NV 89123
15 Office: (702) 487-7574
16 Fax: (702) 901-7553
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
18 PAULA NEWMAN

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

FACTS

As the Court is aware, this case is one of thirty-three related lawsuits (“Related Cases”) sitting before this Court. Recognizing the complexity of litigating these lawsuits simultaneously, the parties agreed to divide the cases into five groups and stagger deadlines in order to streamline the litigation process and avoid overlapping dispositive motion deadlines. (*See* ECF No. 51, 2:4-1).

On May 31, 2017, Defendant filed their Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 55). Defendant also filed three other Motions for Summary Judgment in the related cases.¹

In *Newman v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty-one pages and fifty-three exhibits (ECF No. 55), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 57) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 56), totaling approximately 652 (six-hundred and fifty-two) pages. In *Harel v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty and twenty-nine exhibits (ECF No. 48), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 50) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 49), totaling approximately 259 (two-hundred and fifty-nine) pages. In *Coureys v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of twenty-six pages and nineteen exhibits (ECF No.47), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 49) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 48), totaling approximately 211 (two-hundred and eleven) pages. In *Santovito. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty and twenty-eight exhibits (ECF No. 61), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 63) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 62), totaling approximately 489 (Four-hundred and eighty-nine) pages.

¹ The Motions for Summary Judgment filed on May 31, 2017 are: *Newman v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01486-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 55); *Harel v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01497-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 48); *Courey v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01488-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 47); and *Santovito v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01032-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 61).

On May 15, 2017, Watkins & Letofsky lost their associate, Amy Buchanan, due to a string of ongoing medical issues. While Amy Buchanan was kept off the Related Cases as a courtesy to Defense counsel, the firm had to redistribute her case load amongst the two Nevada partners and remaining Nevada associate. This caused a delay in the cases the firm is handling.

The current deadline for Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' dispositive motions is June 30, 2017. Plaintiff files this current motion seeking an extension until July 14, 2017 to provide a meaningful response to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment.

II.

ARGUMENT

A. LEGAL STANDARD FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 6 (b) EXTENDING TIME.

(1) *In General.* When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:

(A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires; or

(B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) permits a party to extend a deadline prior to its expiration upon a showing of "good cause." The standard to be applied by a court under FRCP 6(b)(1) is a liberal one in order to "effectuate the general purpose of seeing that cases are tried on the merits." *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258-59 (9 Cir. 2010). "Good cause is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts." *Id* at 1259.

“Consequently, requests for extensions of time made before the applicable deadline has passed should ‘normally … be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice to the adverse party.’” *Id.* (Internal citation omitted).

Here, Plaintiff's counsel was served with the instant Motion for Summary Judgment on May 31, 2017. Also on May 31, 2017, Plaintiff's counsel was served with three other motions

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS (Third Request)**

1 for summary judgment in the Related Cases.² Two weeks earlier, Plaintiff's counsel lost one of
 2 their two Nevada associates.

3 Plaintiff has good cause to request this timely³ extension of the deadlines to respond to
 4 Defendants' four simultaneous filings of their Motions for Summary Judgment because of the
 5 sheer volume and size of the motions in addition to the mass amount of evidence⁴ obtained in
 6 discovery to refute the motions and the subtleties and nuances between the FMLA and ADA
 7 causes of action in these specific cases.

8 In *Newman v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty-one
 9 pages and fifty-three exhibits (ECF No. 55), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 57) and Index of
 10 Exhibits (ECF No. 56), totaling approximately 652 (six-hundred and fifty-two) pages. In *Harel*
 11 *v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty and twenty-nine exhibits
 12 (ECF No. 48), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 50) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 49), totaling
 13 approximately 259 (two-hundred and fifty-nine) pages. In *Courey v. Eldorado Resorts*
 14 *Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of twenty-six pages and nineteen exhibits (ECF
 15 No. 47), a Notice of Filing (ECF No. 49) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 48), totaling
 16 approximately 211 (two-hundred and eleven) pages. In *Santovito. Eldorado Resorts*
 17 *Corporation, et al.*, the motion consisted of thirty and twenty-eight exhibits (ECF No. 61), a
 18 Notice of Filing (ECF No. 63) and Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 62), totaling approximately 489
 19 (Four-hundred and eighty-nine) pages.

20 It would be challenging to respond to a single Motion for Summary Judgment of this size
 21 and magnitude within the time frame required. However, responding to all four is simply
 22 impractical within the deadlines that the parties originally contemplated. Using the Related
 23 Cases as a guide, it suggests that Plaintiff's counsel needs on average an extra two weeks over
 24

25 ² The Motions for Summary Judgment filed on May 31, 2017 are: *Newman v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*,
 26 2:15-cv-01486-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 55); *Harel v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01497-RFB-PAL
 27 (ECF No. 48); *Courey v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01488-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 47); and
 28 *Santovito v. Eldorado Resorts Corporation, et al.*, 2:15-cv-01032-RFB-PAL (ECF No. 61)

³ Plaintiff's deadline to respond to dispositive motions is June 30, 2017.

⁴ Including but not limited to years of medical records, paystubs, chargeback records and time sheets.

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
 DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS (Third Request)**

1 the current 30 days' that the parties originally contemplated. Furthermore, the ongoing issues
2 medical issues with one of their Nevada associates have added an additional strain to the office.
3 Consequently, Plaintiff needs additional time to file their opposition. Plaintiff believes that they
4 can have their opposition and the three oppositions in the Related Cases completed by
5 approximately July 14, 2017.

6 **III.**

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 For the above stated reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests an extension of time until
9 approximately July 14, 2017, to allow Plaintiff to file their responses to Defendants' Motion for
10 Summary Judgment.

11 DATED: June 24th, 2017

12 WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP

13
14 By: /s/ Daniel R. Watkins

15
16 DANIEL R. WATKINS
17 BRIAN S. LETOFSKY
18 WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP
19 8215 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 265
20 Las Vegas, NV 89123
21 Office: (702) 487-7574
22 Fax: (702) 901-7553
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff, PAULA NEWMAN

24 ORDER

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.



26 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
27 United States District Judge

28 DATE: July 13, 2017.

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS (Third Request)**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM ECF registrants:

Anthony L. Martin
Jill Garcia

I am an employee with Watkins & Letofsky and am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. postal service on the same day in the ordinary course of business, addressed to the following:

Anthony Martin, Esq.
Jill Garcia, Esq.
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK, &
STEWART, P.C.
Wells Fargo Tower, Suite 1500
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Attorney for Defendants,
ELDORADO RESORTS CORPORATION,
MICHAEL MARRS, BRUCE POLANSKY,
DOMINIC TALEGHANI, KRISTEN BECK,
and JAMES GRIMES

Executed on this 30th day of June, 2017 at Newport Beach, California.

/s/ Susan Watkins

Susan Watkins, an employee of
WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS (Third Request)**